



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/582,771	08/29/2000	Norbert W. Quast	DB000852-000	2847

24122 7590 03/12/2003

THORP REED & ARMSTRONG, LLP
ONE OXFORD CENTRE
301 GRANT STREET, 14TH FLOOR
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219-1425

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/582,771

Applicant(s)

QUAST, NORBERT W.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3 – 6, 8 - 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtilo "Improving Module reuse by interface adaptation" p. 208 - 217.

As to claim 1, Purtilo teaches a running time system (system can create an execution-time module, p. 208 col. 2 paragraph 1), several components (components, p. 210 col. 2 paragraph 3), data acquisition (calling module, p. 210 paragraph 4) data disposal (called module, p. 210 paragraph 1), independent of program-defined interfaces (Nimble can create a new actual interface, p. 210 col. 2 paragraph 5).

Purtilo does not explicitly teach first and second components.

It would have been obvious to modify the teaching of Purtilo's to make data acquisition to be the first component and data disposal to be second component because they are the method flow between two modules.

As to claim 3, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to recognize that data acquisition and/or data disposal is carried out without the cooperation of said second component.

As to claim 4, as best understood, the second component is inactive since data acquisition and/or data disposal is carried out without.

As to claim 5, it would have been obvious to keep the data in a region.

As to claim 6, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to manipulate any kinds of data in function calls.

As to claim 8, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the called component can directly access an access data region.

As to claim 9, Purtilo teaches docking point (annotated actual parameter list is provided, p. 210 col. 2 paragraph 5).

As to claim 10, Purtilo teaches docking points (annotated actual parameter list is provided, p. 210 col. 2 paragraph 5), at least one docking point was found by entering call information (pick and choose, p. 210 col. 2 paragraph 5) about the further component at each docking point found.

As to claim 11, Purtilo teaches all interaction interfaces (actual interface pattern, p. 210 col. 2 paragraph 5).

As to claim 12, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify data fields to be screen fields.

As to claim 13, Purtilo teaches entering said call information into the docking point (the annotated actual parameter is used for entering information, p. 210 col. 2 paragraph 5).

3. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtilo "Improving Module reuse by interface adaptation" p. 208 – 217, in view of Craze US patent no. 5,809,564.

As to claim 2, Craze teaches the data transmitted during the data acquisition are transferred from a memory image portion (storing the return address in a memory, col. 4 lines 1 – 20) of said second component into a transfer data region of said first component.

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Craze to Purtilo's system because data have to be stored in memory.

As to claim 7, Craze teaches a waiting list (stack, col. 4 lines 1 – 15).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Craze to Purtilo's system because the waiting list is used to keep all access data.

4. Claims 14 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purtilo "Improving Module reuse by interface adaptation" p. 208 – 217, and in view of Dievendorff US patent no. 6,425,017.

As to claim 14, Dievendorff teaches generating at least one binary object (binary standards for objects, col. 9 lines 55 – 65) from the definition of the further component.

As to claim 15, it is the design of the system to have the maximum of one binary object for each docking point.

As to claim 16, as best understood, every component needs memory allocation for accessing to it.

Art Unit: 2126

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 605-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alvin Oberley can be reached on (703)305-9716. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-7239 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)746-7140.


ALVIN OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

ph
March 9, 2003